

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/530,694

Applicant(s)

NAKAOKA ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin M Bernatz

Art Unit

1773

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kevin M Bernatz.

(3) _____.

(2) Peter Olexy.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11/7 and 11/15/02.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: the examiner noted that the language consisting essentially of did not exclude additional elements from the iron layers since the specification did not provide evidence that additional elements would effect the base and novel characteristic (see Paragraph 3 of the attached Office Action). The examiner recommended amending to "consisting of iron" if applicants' desired to exclude the NiFe alloys in the prior art.

The examiner further indicated that there appeared to be patentable subject matter if applicants amended to "consisting of iron", as well as included language better defining the structure that resulted from the processing treatment disclosed + claimed by applicants. The examiner recommended incorporating the following language (or something comparable) into claims 1 and 6: "wherein the resulting structure of the magnetic material is a plurality of longitudinally elongated discrete phases of layers "B" stacked in a matrix consisting of Fe having magnetism". Applicants' agent agreed to consult with applicants to determine if appropriate language could be agreed upon. No agreement was reached at the time of the mailing of this Office action. .